

Remarks

The disclosure was objected to due to typographical and grammatical errors. The specification has been amended to correct typographical and grammatical errors. Figure 4 was objected to based on the numbering of FPA 330 in the drawing. The specification on page 14 has been amended to correctly identify element 330 and thereby obviate this objection.

Claims 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims have been amended or deleted to correct the specific deficiencies noted.

The Office Action sets forth an objection to the specification and a rejection of Claims 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph which indicates that the claims are incomplete in that they fail to recite what is asserted to be an essential step, namely, the use of a acousto-optic filter. Applicants are unable to ascertain where in the present specification, or in the Lewis et al. reference, there is a basis for the assertion that an acousto-optic filter is essential for the present invention. The Examiner is invited to identify the grounds for this rejection of the claims.

Claims 15-17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alfano et al. (5,293,872) in view of Lewis et al and Ito or Nagasaki, et al. Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of Sekiguchi.

Lewis et al. has been relied upon for teaching the combination of a focal plane array with an acousto-optic tunable filter to provide for a spectroscopic imaging device. However Lewis fails to disclose how to use a focal plane array (FPA) in conjunction with fiber optics to provide an endoscopic system and particularly the use of an endoscope for internal examination of

a body lumen. Alfano ('872) fails to disclose or suggest the use of such a device as well. Note that the only description in Lewis relating to biological material is with respect to cross-sections of stained cells at Column 12, lines 48-66. Thus Lewis fails to teach one skilled in the art regarding the use of an FPA Raman endoscope as recited in the claims. Ito and Nagasaki both fail to teach or suggest the use of a distally mounted sensor to detect endogenous fluorescense or Raman scattered light. Although, Sekiguchi discloses the use of a distal detector for detecting fluorescense, this procedure requires the use of an applied fluorescent material. There remains no teaching or suggestion in the prior art that a distally mounted sensor on an endoscope would be able to detect endogenous spectroscopic information.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims as amended and are presenting new claims 21 -34 for examination at this time.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will assist in expediting the examination of the application, he/she is invited to call the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas O. Hoover, Esq.
Registration No.: 32,470
Attorney for Applicants
(617) 861-6240

Lexington, Massachusetts
Dated: September 15, 1997